REMARKS

Claims 9-12 and 20-21 are presently pending, and claim 23 is added. Claims 1-4 and 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5-8, 16-19, and 22 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from the combination of Piazza in view of Vartti.

Piazza indicates that "The compressed macroblock is then loaded into cache memory 810 (paragraph 0066). Cache memory 810 is the claimed 'local buffer'." Office Action at 3. However, Piazza does not teach that "compressed video data stored in the local buffer, <u>wherein the portion comprises a macroblock row</u>".

Claim 9 is amended to recite, among other limitations:

The video decoder of claim 9

a local buffer for storing a ~~portion~~ <u>a macroblock row</u> of compressed video data;

a decompression engine for decoding the ~~portion~~ <u>macroblock row</u> of the compressed video data stored in the local buffer~~, wherein the portion comprises a macroblock row~~; and

an extractor for transmitting an indicator to a direct memory access engine indicating that the ~~portion~~ <u>macroblock row</u> of the compressed video data stored in the local buffer can be overwritten by another ~~portion~~ <u>macroblock row</u> of the compressed video data, after the decompression engine decodes the ~~portions~~ <u>macroblock row</u> of the video data stored in the local buffer.

According to the Office Action, states that "the storage of 'a macroblock row', or a slice is known in the art, is non-patentable over the prior art at least since first, a slice buffer was known in the art at

5

the time of the invention, and second even if Piazza recites storin one macroblock, rathar than one portion, of data, the mere change in size of na otherwise identical buffer ot accommodate a macroblock row of data rather than a single macroblock is considered inventive.

Claim 9 as amended changes not only the size of the memory, but also the operation of the decompression engine and the extractor. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 9-12, and 20-21.

Claim 12 recites, among other limitations,

> The video decoder of claim 9 for decoding video data, said video decoder comprising:
>
> a local buffer for storing a ~~portion~~ a macroblock row of compressed video data;
>
> a decompression engine for decoding the ~~portion~~ macroblock row of the compressed video data stored in the local buffer~~, wherein the portion comprises a macroblock row~~; and
>
> an extractor for transmitting an indicator to a direct memory access engine indicating that the ~~portion~~ macroblock row of the compressed video data stored in the local buffer can be overwritten by another ~~portion~~ macroblock row of the compressed video data, after the decompression engine decodes the ~~portions~~ macroblock row of the video data stored in the local buffer.

The Office Action indicates that there is no patentable distinction between the macroblock and macroblock row, citing a number of cases holding "that a mere change in size of an existing device without any

6

change in functionality is insufficient to establish patentability."

Assignee traverses the rejection to claim 12 because the use of macroblock rows does result in a change of functionality. It is noted that in MPEG-2, a new macroblock row is guaranteed to begin a new slice. A slice is the smallest data structure that can be variable length decoded into symbols. Thus, by writing in units of macroblock rows, this allows the decompression engine to decompress a macroblock row, the next variable length decoded macroblock row is ready for the decompression engine.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claim 12 and newly added claim 23.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims is in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

Please charge any required fees not paid herewith or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

October 12, 2010

Mirut Dalal
Registration No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100